(d) the details of charges listed in the show cause notice of 1st June, 1990 and those listed in the charge-sheet of dated 21st May, 1990?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) Employees referred to ing Executive and one former Medical ing Executive and one former Medical Representative of IDPL. The authority take a decision in respect of such employees is the management of the company. These two employees were charge-sheeted In November/December, 1989 respectively under Rule 25 of IDPL Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules.

(b) Suspension is not an automatic and mechanical process. The attendant circumstances, gravity of the charge and such relevant factors whether the employees concerned are likely to temper with documents, evidence or influence witnesses and others, are also looked into.

(c) The said two employees were not placed under suspension. They were on unauthorised absence from duty. They were not entitled to any substitence allowance or leave salary.

(d) The sole charge listed in the show cause notice dated 1.6.90 was unauthorised absence from duty for more than 30 days. In the charge-sheet dated 21.5.90, the charges were unauthorised absence from 12.3.89 and use of intemperate language, smacking of insubordination on the part of the former Marketing Executive of IDPL.

Inquiry conducted by the Director

1913. SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply given to the Unstarred Question No 226c dated 30th July, 1992 and 4622 dated 20th August, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that prior to the transfer, the marketing executive was condemned on consideration by the then Director (Mktg.) and was affirmed by him and are available on records, if so, what are the reasons therefor;

(b) whether an enquiry was entrusted on the charges of the Director (Mkt,.) against the said employee by the then Executive Director (V) with reasons therefor;

(c) if so, what was the outcome of the enquiry;

(d) whether the charges were proved or not, if so, the reasons therefor; and

(e) whether it is a fact that the said marketing executive was sanctioned leave up to 31st May, 1989?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) No, Sir.

(b) to (d) Some investigations were made and there was no prima facie case for any action. It was not necessary to reveal the details of the investigations to the official.

(e) No, Sir.

Safeguards provided in IDPL Rules

1914. SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Law Ministry has given their opinion on the validity of the newly introduced rule 30+1 A of IDPL to the Ministry of Chemicals;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) if not, the reasons therefor;

(d) what is the rule 30 of IDPL, CDA Rules, the details thereof; and

(e) what safeguards are provided in rule 30-A for the employees, with reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (c) The advice of the Law Ministry is awaited.